



Department of Education  
Department of Health  
Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division  
Early Intervention Section

## *Integrated Performance Monitoring*

*Performance Period October 2002-March 2003*

### Introduction

The Hawaii Continuous Integrated Monitoring and Improvement Process (CIMIP) continues to be implemented Statewide in order to sustain the quality assurance and improvement gains made over the years. The process includes Internal Student Services Reviews utilizing the case-based review process, which allows personnel in Complexes to examine the quality of their local service systems, and develop real-time practice improvement strategies to address areas of concerns.

DOE and DOH consider monitoring to be a key component of any program's success, and is needed to ensure the existence of continuing progress for students. The CIMIP aligns the existing accountability systems in schools, the Family Guidance Centers, and Early Intervention Services with community expectations and national policies. This system involves a chain of responses to perceived needs and demands; activities to fill these demands; outcomes from these activities; and feedback on the outcomes. "One of the outstanding characteristics of an effective coach is the frequency and quality of the feedback he or she provides to reinforce, support, and help others to continue to improve. Feedback is absolutely critical across the organization." (Jim Clemmer, *Firing on All Cylinders*).

The framework involves using information derived from the Internal Reviews by Complex and District quality assurance (QA) teams. The QA teams examine data and trends, and act on interagency improvements. The Internal Reviews are supported by State-level personnel who provide training and mentoring. They also perform verification checks on a random sample of youth reviewed in the Internal Review and receive and provide feedback on reports and improvement plans.

### Findings

Internal Reviews were conducted in the second and third quarters for 36 complexes: 11 in the second quarter and 25 in the third. The overall performance goal for the State is that each complex will achieve 85% or better system performance on their Internal Reviews. To date, 85% of complexes have achieved the goal.. In the reporting period (second and third quarters) six complexes did not meet the performance target for system performance.

In the second quarter, those complexes falling short of the performance goal for system performance were Kahuku (83% system performance, 100% child status), Hilo (78% system performance, 100% child status), Farrington (78% system performance, 100% child status). It should be noted that each of the complexes were demonstrating acceptable child status for all of the students reviewed.

Complexes not achieving goals for the third quarter were Pahoia (69% system performance, 100% child status), Central Kauai (83% system performance, 100% child status), Nanakuli (64% system performance, 64% child status). In the third quarter, of the complexes that did not meet the performance goal, only Nanakuli had less than 100% of youth demonstrating acceptable child status.

In addition to the six complexes discussed above, there were three complexes that did achieve the goal for acceptable system performance, however the indicators for child status were below acceptable scores. Local-level quality assurance teams need to evaluate the factors impacting child well-being in those communities. The complexes where this examination should occur are Ka'u (77%), Campbell (77%), and Kohala (75%). This recommendation is also made for Nanakuli, where acceptable child status was 64%, as previously stated.

Table 1. Statewide Internal Review Results (Second and Third Quarter)

STATE TOTAL n=500		
<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance <b>87% (n=433)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance <b>4% (n=21)</b>	<b>91%</b> <b>(n=454)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance <b>7% (n=38)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance <b>2% (n=8)</b>	
<b>94%</b> <b>(n=471)</b>		

Statewide Internal Review results for the second and third quarters are displayed in Table 1. Of the 500 youth reviewed in this time period, the local service systems were performing consistently well for 454 or 91%. Of the youth reviewed, 471 or 94% were doing acceptably well across indicators of child-well-being. These results indicate that at a Statewide level, key service system functions are dependable and working well for the vast majority of youth served.

Beyond the results of the Internal Reviews, there are observations based on the first year of implementation. Many staff from across the Departments, mostly from the DOE, have participated in the review process. Because of the value of case-based reviews in training and practice development, this is seen as a positive trend. At the same time, controls around the integrity of the review must be maintained in order to have a credible and sustainable process. In implementing the verification checks, it became apparent that the quality of many of the case-based reports was not at the level necessary to support determinations for indicators. The number of verification checks that were only partially supported supports this. The Departments will need to commit to a review of the training and operational aspects of the Internal Reviews. The "lessons learned" from the first full year of independent Internal Reviews and quality assurance need to inform strengthened implementation of these vital processes. A formal planning retreat is planned for June where DOE and DOH will review all areas for improvement.

## Description of the Samples

There were 160 students reviewed in the second quarter and 340 in the third quarter, for a total of 500. In the first three quarters of the fiscal year, 526 youth were reviewed. Tables 2 and 3 show the distribution of cases reviewed across school levels and Early Intervention. The sample size is determined by the number of schools in the complex in order to assure that students from each school are reviewed. All reviews are conducted using the Coordinated Services Review Protocol

Table 2. Distribution of Sample-Second Quarter

	High School	Middle School	Elementary School	Early Intervention	2nd Quarter
Castle	3	3	8	4	18
Kahuku	3	3	6	0	12
Roosevelt	3	7	6	1	17
Hilo	4	6	7	1	18
Waialua	2	4	6	0	12
Farrington	3	6	9	0	18
Kapolei	3	3	6	3	15
Kealahou	3	3	6	2	14
Hana	5	3	4	0	12
Kaiser	3	3	6	0	12
Kea'au	4	4	4	0	12
<b>Total</b>	36	45	68	11	160

Table 3. Distribution of Sample-Third Quarter

	High School	Middle School	Elementary School	Early Intervention	3rd Quarter
Pahoa	5	3	4	1	13
Central Kauai	4	4	5	1	14
Lahainaluna	4	4	4	1	13
Leilehua	3	6	7	1	17
Kalani	3	3	8	1	15
Maui	2	4	7	0	13
Nanakuli	3	3	4	1	11
Radford	3	3	7	1	14
Kalaheo	3	3	6	1	13
Kekaulike	3	3	6	1	13
Waipahu	3	3	6	1	13
Kaimuki	3	2	8	1	14
Honoka'a	2	8	6	1	17
Aiea	3	3	6	1	13
Kailua	3	3	6	1	13
Baldwin	3	3	6	1	13
Moanalua	3	2	7	1	13
McKinley	3	6	6	1	16
West Kauai	3	3	6	1	13
Konawaena	4	3	5	1	13
Ka'u	5	3	4	1	13
Pearl City	3	3	8	1	15
Molokai	3	0	9	1	13
Campbell	3	3	6	1	13
Kohala	5	4	3	0	12
<b>Total</b>	82	85	150	23	340

Further descriptions of the sample are presented in Tables 4 and 5. The total sample represented 2% of the IDEA population and 1% of the 504 population. Of the total number of cases reviewed (N=500), 20% were receiving care coordination from the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division (CAMHD). Approximately 49% were IDEA or 504 Felix class students that are case managed by the schools, 24% are IDEA non-Felix students, and 7% are case managed by Early Intervention Services.

Table 4. Description of Sample-Second Quarter

	CAMHD Felix	IDEA / 504 Felix	IDEA Non-Felix	Early Intervention	2nd Quarter
Castle	2	9	3	4	18
Kahuku	3	6	3	0	12
Roosevelt	3	8	5	1	17
Hilo	3	9	5	1	18
Waialua	2	7	3	0	12
Farrington	3	11	4	0	18
Kapolei	2	8	2	3	15
Kealahou	3	5	4	2	14
Hana	1	5	6	0	12
Kaiser	2	7	3	0	12
Kea'au	3	6	3	0	12
<b>Total</b>	27	81	41	11	160

Table 5. Description of Sample-Third Quarter

	CAMHD Felix	IDEA / 504 Felix	IDEA Non-Felix	Early Intervention	3rd Quarter
Pahoa	3	6	3	1	13
Central Kauai	3	6	4	1	14
Lahainaluna	3	6	3	1	13
Leilehua	3	8	5	1	17
Kalani	3	7	4	1	15
Maui	3	6	4	0	13
Nanakuli	3	5	2	1	11
Radford	2	8	3	1	14
Kalaheo	3	6	3	1	13
Kekaulike	3	6	3	1	13
Waipahu	3	6	3	1	13
Kaimuki	2	8	3	1	14
Honoka'a	4	8	4	1	17
Aiea	3	6	3	1	13
Kailua	2	6	4	1	13
Baldwin	3	7	2	1	13
Moanalua	3	5	4	1	13
McKinley	5	7	3	1	16
West Kauai	3	6	3	1	13
Konawaena	3	6	3	1	13
Ka'u	3	6	3	1	13
Pearl City	3	8	3	1	15
Molokai	3	6	3	1	13
Campbell	2	7	3	1	13
Kohala	3	6	3	0	12
<b>Total</b>	74	162	81	23	340

Tables 6 and 7 display the range of IDEA disability categories that were represented in the samples. The 500 students reviewed represent 11 out of the 14

IDEA eligibility categories. The largest percentages of youth were in the categories Emotional Disturbance (21%) and Specific Learning Disability (20%). Mental Retardation (9%) and Other health Impaired (11%) were the next most frequent. All eligibility categories were represented in the reviews.

Table 6. Disability Categories-Second Quarter

	Castle	Kahuku	Roosevelt	Hilo	Waialua	Farrington	Kapolei	Kealahou	Hana	Kaiser	Keaau	Total
Autism	2	1		1		2				2	1	9
Deaf/Blindness												0
Deafness												0
Developmental Delay	1	2	1	1	2	1						8
Emotional Disturbance	6	1	5	5	3	4	3	2	2	2	3	36
Hearing Impairment						1					1	2
Mental Retardation	1	1	2	3		3	1	2		1	1	15
Multiple Disabilities												0
Orthopedic Impairment		1			1							2
Other Health Impairments		2	2	2	1	2		3	3	2	1	18
Specific Learning Disability	2	2	6	4	4	3	6	2	5	2	4	40
Speech/Language Impairment	1					1		1	1	1	1	6
Traumatic Brain Injury												0
Visual Impairment										1		1
504 Felix	1	2		1	1	1	2	2	1	1		12
IDEA, Part C	4	0	1	1			3	2				11
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>160</b>

Table 7. Disability Categories-Third Quarter

	Pahoa	Central Kauai	Lahaina	Lelehu	Kalani	Maui	Nanakuli	Radford	Kalaheo	Kekaulike	Waipahu	Kaimuki	Honokaa	Aiea	Kailua	Baldwin	Moanalua	McKinley	West Kauai	Konawaena	Ka'u	Pearl City	Molokai	Campbell	Kohala	Total
Autism	2	1		1	1	2	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3		1			2	1	1	1	26
Deaf/Blindness											1															1
Deafness																1										1
Developmental Delay		1	1	2	1	1		1	1	1	1	2	1				1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1		23
Emotional Disturbance	2	2	1	3	3	1	2	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	1	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	5	71
Hearing Impairment										1	1			1	1				1			1	1			7
Mental Retardation	2	1		2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1		1	3	1	2	1	1		1	1	30
Multiple Disabilities	1		1	1	1		1				1				1				1		1	1				10
Orthopedic Impairment								1	1			1			1											4
Other Health Impairments		2	2	5	2	1	1		1	1		1	3		1	5	1	1	1	1	3	1	3	3		39
Specific Learning Disability	4	3	5	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	1	1	3	4	2	1	2	2		3	2	3	2	2	3	58
Speech/Language Impairment		1	1		2		1	1		1	1	1	2			1	1					1				14
Traumatic Brain Injury					1	1													1		1					4
Visual Impairment						1		1	1									1	1					1		6
504 Felix	1	2	1			2	1	1		1	1	1	2			1		2	1	1			2	1	2	23
IDEA, Part C	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	23
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>340</b>

## Participants

A total of 964 school, Family Guidance Center (FGC), community members including several parents participated in the Internal Reviews in the reporting quarters. The largest group represented was school counselors (171), followed by special education teachers (150), Student Services Coordinators (137) and Resource Teachers (101). There was some duplication in counts for CAMHD Quality Assurance Specialists, who participate in multiple complex reviews. The expectation for community involvement has been clarified with the complexes. Staff from State-level DOE and CAMHD Performance Management participate as mentors and/or support for debriefings in every review.

Table 8. Internal Review Participants-Second Quarter

	Castle	Kahuku	Roosevelt	Hilo	Waialua	Farrington	Kapolei	Kealahou	Hana	Kaiser	Kea'au	Total
Counselor (School, Special Education, High Risk, Academic, 504, Department Chair)	8	2	11	0	5	12	7	0	4	3	0	52
Educational Assistant	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4
Principal	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	7
Vice Principal	2	1	2	0	2	6	1	0	1	2	0	17
Psychological Examiner	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
DOE Mentors	3	2	2	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	4	16
Resource Teacher (State, District, Complex, PSAP, Student Support, Literacy, CSSS)	1	2	3	5	5	1	3	2	3	3	4	32
SBBH Therapist, Manager	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	8
Psychologist (District, Complex, School)	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	11
Special Education Department Chair	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6
Special Education Teacher (including Pre-School Teacher)	1	2	7	0	6	7	0	1	4	12	1	41
Speech Language Pathologist	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Student Services Coordinator	6	7	1	3	0	5	2	2	0	4	1	31
Teacher (General Ed, Title I, Reading, Transition)	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	5
Coordinator (Evaluation, School Health, SID, Curriculum, Literacy, Rise)	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
School Assessment Liaison	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Librarian, Reading Specialist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Autism Consultant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Special Education Director, Educational Specialist, School Renewal Specialist, District Educational Specialist, Retired Administrator	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Social Worker	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
Parent/Community Member, UH Faculty Member	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Branch Chief, Clinical Director	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CAMHD Program Manager, Supervisor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Specialist, DOH	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3
Family Support Worker, FGC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mental Health Care Coordinator, Mentor	0	2	1	4	0	0	1	2	2	0	3	15
Mental Health Supervisor	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Early Intervention Personnel	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	7
<b>2nd Quarter Total Participants</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>278</b>

Table 9. Internal Review Participants-Third Quarter

	Pahoa	Central Kauai	Lahaina	Lelehua	Kalani	Maui High	Nanakuli	Radford	Kalaheo	Kekaulike	Waipahu	Kaimuki	Honoka'a	Aiea	Kailua	Baldwin	Moanalua	McKinley	West Kauai	Konawaena	Ka'u	Pearl City	Molokai	Campbell	Kohala	Total
Counselor (School, Special Education, High Risk, Academic, 504, Department Chair)	1		2	9	12	2	5	6	13		5	6		7	1	4	9	13			1	3	5	7		111
Educational Assistant																										0
Principal			2	2	2	1			2			1		1	3			1								15
Vice Principal	1					2				2	1	1		2			2									11
Psychological Examiner		1												1			1						1			4
DOE Mentors	3	1	2		4	3		2			1	2	2	1	1		3		1	3	2	2	1		2	36
Resource Teacher (State, District, Complex, PSAP, Student Support, Literacy, CSSS)	1		2	2	3		1	5	2	4		3	5	4	1	2	2	3	1	3	1	2	2	2	5	56
SBBH Therapist, Manager					1	1		1	2	3		2			2	1				2			4			19
Psychologist (District, Complex, School)	1	1		1	2		1	1	2	1			1					1		2						14
Special Education Department Chair			2	3				1	3												1	2	4			16
Special Education Teacher (including Pre-School Teacher)	3			15	3	2	5	1		3	9	2	1	7	5	5	4	4			1	17	2	14	1	104
Speech Language Pathologist								1																		1
Student Services Coordinator	2		4	5	6	4	2	9	7	8	3	6	4	1	6	2	3	10		3	4	3	3	1	1	97
Teacher (General Ed, Title I, Reading, Transition)					1		7	2				1		3	1	2						1		5		23
Coordinator (Evaluation, School Health, SID, Curriculum, Literacy, Rise)					1							1					1					1		1		5
School Assessment Liaison					1													1								2
Librarian, Reading Specialist												1														1
Autism Consultant																		1								1
Special Education Director, Educational Specialist, School Renewal Specialist, District Educational Specialist, Retired Administrator								1	1	1						3		3			1	1		1		12
Social Worker		2		2	1			2	2						2		1									12
Parent/Community Member, UH Faculty Member					1								1							1		1				4
Branch Chief, Clinical Director		2																	1							3
CAMHD Program Manager, Supervisor							2				1				2							2				7
Quality Assurance Specialist, DOH				1	1			1	1	1	1	1		1			1					1	1	1	1	12
Family Support Worker, FGC		5																	4							9
Mental Health Care Coordinator, Mentor	3	1			1			1							2				1	2	3					14
Mental Health Supervisor		1							1			1			2				1						2	8
Early Intervention Personnel	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	21
<b>3rd Quarter Total Participants</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>618</b>

## Review Outcomes and Trends

Table 10 represents the aggregated results for reviews conducted in the second quarter of fiscal year 2003 (October 2002-March 2003). As discussed earlier, 33 of the 39 complexes met or exceeded the performance goal in the second and third quarters. For the entire population across all complexes, the system performance result was 91%.

Content analysis of Internal Review reports indicate the most frequently cited strengths were increased satisfaction of parents, expanded and more timely student services, student progress including increased attendance, team functioning, and increased communication and coordination. Continued challenges were most often identified in the areas of assuring communication among all team members, keeping up with documentation requirements and quality of documentation, assuring compliance, engaging parents, implementation of reading strategies, adequacy of transition planning and transition implementation.

The six complexes that did not meet the performance target of 85% or better system performance were Farrington, Hilo, Kahuku, Central Kauai, Nanakuli, and Pahoa. The data for these complexes were further analyzed to identify areas that would benefit from strengthened practice as well as barriers to effective service provision. The service system was found to be performing acceptably well for 65 (76%) of the 86 children and youth that were reviewed. The system performance results for youth review are displayed in the Table 10. Three of the four (75%) children with Early Intervention involvement were acceptable as were 15 of the 18 youth (88%) with FGC care coordination. Of the youth care coordinated through the schools, 32 of 43 (74%) who were IDEA or 504 Felix class youth, and 15 of the 22 (68%) IDEA non-Felix youth had acceptable system performance.

Table 10. System Performance Results by Agency Involvement

Complex		Early Intervention	FGC Care Coordinated	IDEA/504 Felix	IDEA
Farrington	Acceptable	0	3	9	2
	Unacceptable	0	0	2	2
Hilo/ Laupahoehoe	Acceptable	1	3	7	3
	Unacceptable	0	0	2	2
Kahuku	Acceptable	0	3	4	3
	Unacceptable	0	0	2	0
Central Kauai	Acceptable	1	2	5	3
	Unacceptable	0	1	1	1
Nanakuli	Acceptable	1	1	2	3
	Unacceptable	0	1	3	0
Pahoa	Acceptable	0	3	5	1
	Unacceptable	1	0	1	2

On other core indicators, the data are showing acceptable performance across most measures. There were no documented complaints and few service gaps in the six complexes. The indicators are showing a concern regarding Hilo's suspension data with a 6.8 regular education to special education suspension ratio (the state average for SY 2002-2003 is 4.28. Kahuku has the best performance in the State in this measure with no suspensions for students under IDEA.



Internal Reviews cited strengths for the six complexes that included committed and unified team members, a growing pattern of parental involvement, improved attendance, and good transitions between elementary and middle schools. Several of the complexes cited strong quality assurance and peer review practices.

The broad areas of challenge that were common to the complexes were communication issues, the need to improve strategies to engage parents, low reading achievement among students, and inconsistent implementation of transitions. There were also documented concerns surrounding the IEP process, including assuring the matching of student need with goals and objectives, measurable goals and objectives, and coordination of the CSP with the IEP. Concerns were cited regarding positions vacancies in School-Based Behavioral Health.

Examination of child status and system performance indicators demonstrates patterns among the complexes as well as within individual areas. While overall child status was overall acceptable at 93% for the six complexes, indications are that child well being in Nanakuli complex is a major concern. Status examinations show that the youth reviewed were not doing acceptably well across most areas. Of particular concern was demonstrating responsible behavior, safety and caregiver functioning. Stability was an issue for almost half of the youth reviewed in the Pahoa Complex and three-quarters of those in the Hilo-Lapahoehoe Complex.

Across indicators of system performance, the complexes generally struggled with functional assessments, most planning indicators, adequate service intensity, coordination of services, and effective problem-solving. Each of the complexes has developed improvement plans that will be monitored for implementation. The entire data set will also be examined and discussed by State-level leadership from a quality assurance perspective within the month.

The data results for the second and third quarter Internal Reviews are displayed below.

Table 11. Results of Internal Reviews for Child Status and System Performance-Second Quarter

	Date	Total Number of Cases	Acceptable Child Status		Acceptable System Performance	
			#	%	#	%
Castle	October 16-18, 29, 2002	18	18	100%	16	89%
Kahuku	October 21, 24, 25, 28, 2002	12	12	100%	10	83%
Roosevelt	October 22, 24, 25, 29, 30, November 2, 2002	17	16	94%	16	94%
Hilo	October 29-November 1, 2002	18	18	100%	14	78%
Waialua	November 12-15, 2002	12	12	100%	11	92%
Farrington	November 12-15, 18-20, 22, 2002	18	18	100%	14	78%
Kapolei	November 15-21, 2002	15	13	87%	13	87%
Kealahou	November 18-22, 2002	14	14	100%	12	86%
Hana	December 2-6, 2002	12	12	100%	11	92%
Kaiser	December 2-6, 9-13, 2002	12	12	100%	12	100%
Kea'au	December 9-12, 2002	12	12	100%	12	100%

Table 11. Results of Internal Reviews for Child Status and System Performance-Third Quarter

	Date	Total Number of Cases	Acceptable Child Status		Acceptable System Performance	
			#	%	#	%
Pahoa	January 21-24, 2003	13	13	100%	9	69%
Central Kauai	January 27-31, 2003	14	13	93%	11	79%
Lahainaluna	January 27-30, 2003	13	12	92%	12	92%
Leilehua	January 27-31, 2003	17	17	100%	16	94%
Kalani	January 27-31, February 2-6, 10, 2003	15	15	100%	14	93%
Maui	February 3-6, 2003	13	12	92%	13	100%
Nanakuli	February 4-7, 2003	11	7	64%	7	64%
Radford	February 3-7, 2003	14	13	93%	13	93%
Kalaheo	February 4, 6, 11, 13, 2003	13	13	100%	12	92%
Kekaulike	February 10-13, 2003	13	13	100%	13	100%
Waipahu	February 10-14, 2003	13	13	100%	13	100%
Kaimuki	February 11-19, 21, 2003	14	13	93%	13	93%
Honoka'a	February 18-21, 25, 2003	17	17	100%	16	94%
Aiea	February 19-21, 24, 2003	13	11	85%	13	100%
Kailua	February 24-28, 2003	13	11	85%	11	85%
Baldwin	February 24-27, 2003	13	13	100%	12	92%
Moanalua	February 24-26, 28, 2003	13	12	92%	13	100%
McKinley	February 25-27, March 3-7, 2003	16	15	94%	16	100%
West Kauai	February 27-28, March 3-5, 2003	13	12	92%	13	100%
Konawaena	March 3-7, 2003	13	13	100%	11	85%
Ka'u	March 3-7, 2003	13	10	77%	11	85%
Pearl City	March 10-14, 2003	15	14	93%	14	93%
Molokai	March 10-14, 2003	13	13	100%	13	100%
Campbell	March 10-14, 2003	13	10	77%	12	92%
Kohala	March 17-21, 2003	12	9	75%	12	100%

## Verification Check Findings

Verification checks are routinely conducted on a random sample of cases that were reviewed by the complexes to determine if Internal Review findings are consistent with quality standards set for external reviews. Of the 500 cases reviewed, 122 cases or 24% were randomly chosen for a verification check. A minimum of four cases is selected per complex representing youth managed through both SBBH and CAMHD. Trained and experienced reviewers conducted the verification checks using a rating tool developed specifically for the task.

Of the cases that went through the verification check process, all but two, or 98.4% were verified as meeting senior reviewers' criteria for an overall correct determination of findings. Within the overall determination, verifiers can make a partial determination of support. For example, reviewers may find that some of the indicators are supported, but some are not.

Findings of the verification checks are showing that many reports are not written at a level that can adequately support the findings of the review. They often lacked sufficient detail that allow the verifier to clearly understand the situation and ascertain how the system was performing for the child and family. Critical discernment and core understanding of the child and service examinations and rating system were missing in many of the reports. The issues identified by the State-level staff verifying reviews will be incorporated into changes in training and oversight for the Internal Reviews. It is critical to address these issues in a timely manner in order to assure the integrity of the review process.

Quarter	Complexes Reviewed	Total # reviewed	Total # verified	# fully supported	# partially supported	# not supported
<b>First</b>	Mililani	14	3	0	3	0
	East Kauai	12	3	1	2	0
<b>Second</b>	Castle	18	4	2	1	1
	Kahuku	12	5	3	2	0
	Roosevelt	17	4	3	1	0
	Hilo	18	6	4	1	0
	Waialua	12	4	4	0	0
	Farrington	18	5	3	2	0
	Kapolei	15	5	5	0	0
	Kealahou	14	5	3	2	0
	Hana	12	4	2	2	0
	Kaiser	12	4	2	2	0
	Kea'au	12	4	3	1	0
	Pahoa	13	4	4	0	0
	Central Kauai	14	2	2	0	0
	Lahainaluna	13	4	2	2	0
	Leilehua	17	3	4	0	0
<b>Third</b>	Kalani	15	4	3	1	0
	Maui	13	4	2	2	0
	Nanakuli	11	4	2	2	0
	Radford	14	4	1	2	1
	Kalaheo	13	4	1	3	0
	Kekaulike	13	4	4	0	0
	Waipahu	13	11	11	0	0
	Kaimuki	14	4	2	2	0
	Honoka'a	17	4	3	1	0
	Aiea	13	4	3	1	0
	Kailua	13	4	0	4	0
	Baldwin	13	4	3	1	0
	Moanalua	13	4	4	0	0
	<b>YEAR TO DATE TOTAL</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>2</b>

## Complex Data

The following section provides a “profile” of each complex reviewed over the second and third quarters of fiscal year 2003. Presented are data by complex on Internal Reviews and core indicators for the Family Guidance Centers and schools. Data are current for the quarter the Internal Review occurred. Family Guidance Center data include number and percentage of clients in out of state treatment settings, in out of home treatment, with service delivery gaps, with complaints, and who have current Coordinated Service Plans (CSPs). Staffing vacancies in the FGC for the complex are also presented. School data for each complex include number of service gaps, percentage of referrals that were processed within timelines, number of written and telephone complaints received by the State Office, number of hearing requests, and percentage of special education teachers that are certified. Also presented are data related to suspensions (regular education to special education numbers and ratios).

## Castle October 2002

### Internal Review Results

n=18

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>89% (n=16)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>89% (n=16)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>14% (n=2)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=18)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	1	50	2%
Out of Home	16	50	32%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	50	0%
Complaints	1	50	2%
CSP timelines	48	50	96%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
4	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	98%	1	0	3	84.95%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	5428	75	830	43	3.75	4.28	3.13

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kahuku October 2002

### Internal Review Results

n=12

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b>  + Child + System Performance  <b>83% (n=10)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b>  - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>83% (n=10)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b>  + Child - System Performance  <b>17% (n=2)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b>  - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	
<b>100% (n=12)</b>		

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	53	0%
Out of Home	7	53	13%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	53	0%
Complaints	1	53	2%
CSP timelines	40	53	75%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
3.5	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	3	93.6%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	3503	10	423	0	0	0	1.25

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Roosevelt October-November 2002

### Internal Review Results

n=17

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>88% (n=15)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>6% (n=1)</b>	<b>94% (n=16)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>6% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**94%  
(n=16)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	23	0%
Out of Home	3	23	13%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	23	0%
Complaints	0	23	0%
CSP timelines	23	23	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
3	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
1	88%	0	0	1	91.2%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	6085	59	509	14	2.84	1.73	1.33

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Hilo October-November 2002

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>78% (n=14)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>78% (n=14)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>22% (n=4)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

100%  
(n=18)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	1	55	2%
Out of Home	23	55	42%
Service Delivery Gaps	2	55	4%
Complaints	0	55	0%
CSP timelines	29	55	53%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
3.44	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	92%	0	1	0	95.2%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	3956	80	669	74	5.47	6.79	5.71

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education



## Waialua November 2002

### Internal Review Results

n=12

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>92% (n=11)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	9	0%
Out of Home	1	9	11%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	9	0%
Complaints	0	9	0%
CSP timelines	2	9	22%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	77%	0	0	0	75.6%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	1342	26	236	24	5.25	6.78	5.08

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Farrington November 2002

### Internal Review Results

n=18

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>78% (n=14)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>78% (n=14)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>22% (n=4)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=18)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	12	0%
Out of Home	1	12	8%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	12	0%
Complaints	0	12	0%
CSP timelines	12	12	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	81%	0	0	0	79.9%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	7604	85	726	2.50	3.57	2.50	1.73

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kapolei November 2002

### Internal Review Results

n=15

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>87% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>87% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>13% (n=2)</b>	

87%  
(n=13)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	1	17	6%
Out of Home	4	17	24%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	17	0%
Complaints	0	17	0%
CSP timelines	8	17	47%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1.5	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	1	80.9%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	5045	65	552	24	3.37	2.7	2.99

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kealakehe November 2002

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>86% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>14% (n=2)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=14)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	2	41	55%
Out of Home	13	41	32%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	41	0%
Complaints	2	41	52%
CSP timelines	38	41	93%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
3.32	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	90%	1	0	0	92.7%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	6085	59	509	14	2.84	1.73	1.33

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Hana December 2002

### Internal Review Results

n=12

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b>  + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b>  - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>92% (n=11)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b>  + Child - System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b>  - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	
<b>100% (n=12)</b>		

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	2	0%
Out of Home	1	2	50%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	2	0%
Complaints	0	2	0%
CSP timelines	2	2	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	1	N/A

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	325	1	70	1	4.33	3.03	2.93

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kaiser December 2002

### Internal Review Results

n=12

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	13	0%
Out of Home	4	13	31%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	13	0%
Complaints	0	13	0%
CSP timelines	5	13	38%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	87%	0	0	0	89.4%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2554	29	244	12	4.33	3.03	.92

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kea'au December 2002

### Internal Review Results

n=12

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	60	0%
Out of Home	26	60	43%
Service Delivery Gaps	3	60	55%
Complaints	2	60	3%
CSP timelines	23	60	38%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
3.38	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	3	0	89%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2401	97	444	115	6.41	8.69	5.13

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Pahoa January 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b>  + Child + System Performance  <b>69% (n=9)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b>  - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>69% (n=9)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b>  + Child - System Performance  <b>31% (n=4)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b>  - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	
<b>100% (n=13)</b>		

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	22	0%
Out of Home	4	22	18%
Service Delivery Gaps	1	22	5%
Complaints	1	22	5%
CSP timelines	12	22	55%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1.57	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	1	88%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	1147	142	323	62	2.05	3.2	4.0

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education



## Central Kauai January 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>79% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>79% (n=11)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>14% (n=2)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	

**93%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	39	0%
Out of Home	16	39	41%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	39	0%
Complaints	0	39	0%
CSP timelines	32	39	82%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
0	0	N/A

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	88%	0	0	0	95.6%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	3617	166	409	61	3.25	2.64	3.12

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Lahainaluna January 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>84.6% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>7.7% (n=1)</b>	<b>92% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>7.7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

92%  
(n=12)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	9	0%
Out of Home	4	9	41%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	9	0%
Complaints	0	9	0%
CSP timelines	9	9	82%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	81%	0	0	0	97.5%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2647	50	324	26	4.25	3.66	6.05

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Leilehua January 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=17

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>94% (n=16)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>94% (n=16)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>6% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=17)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	35	0%
Out of Home	6	35	17%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	35	0%
Complaints	0	35	0%
CSP timelines	35	35	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
3	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	96%	0	2	0	86%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	6499	247	976	67	1.81	2.01	2.33

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kalani January-February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=15

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>93% (n=14)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>

**93%  
(n=14)**

**100%  
(n=15)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	13	0%
Out of Home	2	13	15%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	13	0%
Complaints	0	13	0%
CSP timelines	13	13	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	70%	0	0	1	94.9%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	3835	46	394	19	4.02	3.08	2.9

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Maui High February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

92%  
(n=12)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	34	0%
Out of Home	14	34	41%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	34	0%
Complaints	1	34	3%
CSP timelines	29	34	85%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	69%	0	2	1	100%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	6262	81	774	40	4.0	3.66	2.65

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Nanakuli February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=11

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>55% (n=6)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>9% (n=1)</b>	<b>64% (n=7)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>9% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>27% (n=3)</b>	

**64%  
(n=7)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	26	0%
Out of Home	6	26	23%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	26	0%
Complaints	1	26	4%
CSP timelines	24	26	92%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	70%	0	1	1	90.5%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2448	114	387	40	2.26	2.57	2.76

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Radford February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>93% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

93%  
(n=13)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	5	0%
Out of Home	5	5	100%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	5	0%
Complaints	0	5	0%
CSP timelines	5	5	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	89%	0	2	0	86.8%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	6554	92	662	33	3.55	2.63	2.58

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kalaheo February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b>  + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b>  - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>92% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b>  + Child - System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b>  - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	
<b>100% (n=13)</b>		

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	21	0%
Out of Home	5	21	24%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	21	0%
Complaints	1	21	5%
CSP timelines	18	21	86%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	96%	0	2	0	95.1%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	4099	103	455	30	2.62	2.13	2.55

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education



## King Kekaulike February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	21	0%
Out of Home	5	21	24%
Service Delivery Gaps	1	21	5%
Complaints	0	21	0%
CSP timelines	20	21	95%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	66%	1	0	1	96%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	3892	103	455	30	2.62	2.13	3.15

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Waipahu February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	21	0%
Out of Home	5	21	24%
Service Delivery Gaps	1	21	5%
Complaints	0	21	0%
CSP timelines	20	21	95%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	81%	0	2	0	83.3%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	7638	357	886	101	2.5	2.07	3.23

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kaimuki February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>93% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

93%  
(n=13)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	18	0%
Out of Home	5	18	28%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	18	0%
Complaints	0	18	0%
CSP timelines	18	18	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
3	86%	0	1	0	98.26%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	4180	86	473	43	4.42	3.66	3.09

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Honoka'a February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=17

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>94% (n=16)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>94% (n=16)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>6% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=17)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	40	0%
Out of Home	6	40	24%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	40	0%
Complaints	1	40	5%
CSP timelines	25	40	86%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2.68	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	81%	0	1	0	96.4%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2622	123	423	52	2.62	2.82	4.01

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Aiea February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>85% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>15% (n=2)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

85%  
(n=11)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	8	0%
Out of Home	4	8	50%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	8	0%
Complaints	0	8	0%
CSP timelines	7	8	88%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	96%	0	1	0	81.8%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	4201	120	440	40	3.18	2.44	1.58

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kailua February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>76.9% (n=10)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>7.7% (n=1)</b>	<b>85% (n=11)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>7.7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>7.7% (n=1)</b>	

85%  
(n=11)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	26	0%
Out of Home	7	26	27%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	26	0%
Complaints	0	26	0%
CSP timelines	24	26	92%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	77%	0	2	0	87%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2721	129	560	80	3.01	4.59	4.11

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Baldwin February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>

**92%**  
**(n=12)**

**100%**  
**(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	23	0%
Out of Home	6	23	24%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	23	0%
Complaints	0	23	5%
CSP timelines	23	23	86%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	62%	0	1	0	98.1%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	3857	106	481	40	3.03	2.76	5.0

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Moanalua February 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

92%  
(n=12)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	16	0%
Out of Home	7	16	44%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	16	0%
Complaints	0	16	0%
CSP timelines	15	16	94%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	94%	0	0	0	87.4%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	4686	96	479	41	4.18	3.13	2.53

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education



## McKinley February-March 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=16

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>94% (n=15)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>6% (n=1)</b>	<b>100% (n=16)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**94%  
(n=15)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	13	0%
Out of Home	2	13	15%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	13	0%
Complaints	0	13	0%
CSP timelines	13	13	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	78%	1	2	0	90%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	5621	240	575	42	1.71	1.28	2.52

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## West Kauai February-March 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

92%  
(n=12)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	19	0%
Out of Home	3	19	16%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	19	0%
Complaints	0	19	0%
CSP timelines	19	19	100%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
0	0	N/A

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	88%	0	0	0	96.4%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2463	50	267	35	6.46	5.13	3.28

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Konawaena March 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>85% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>85% (n=11)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>15% (n=2)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	24	0%
Out of Home	11	24	46%
Service Delivery Gaps	1	24	4%
Complaints	0	24	0%
CSP timelines	16	24	67%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1.74	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	75%	0	1	0	90.9%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	2079	95	283	42	3.25	3.24	2.14

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Ka'u March 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>62% (n=8)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>23% (n=3)</b>	<b>85% (n=11)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>15% (n=2)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

77%  
(n=10)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	13	0%
Out of Home	5	13	38%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	13	0%
Complaints	0	13	0%
CSP timelines	8	13	62%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
1.06	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	0	88.4%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	731	33	137	20	3.23	4.44	3.81

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Pearl City March 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=15

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86.7% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>6.7% (n=1)</b>	<b>93% (n=14)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>6.7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**93%  
(n=14)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	19	0%
Out of Home	4	19	21%
Service Delivery Gaps	2	19	11%
Complaints	0	19	0%
CSP timelines	17	19	89%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	97%	0	4	0	89.7%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	6308	306	750	160	4.40	3.83	3.19

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Molokai March 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	1	5	20%
Out of Home	2	5	40%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	5	0%
Complaints	0	5	0%
CSP timelines	4	5	80%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
2	89%	0	0	0	91.1%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	1233	70	280	46	2.85	4.80	7.33

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Campbell March 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>77% (n=10)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>15% (n=2)</b>	<b>92% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	

77%  
(n=10)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	18	0%
Out of Home	10	18	56%
Service Delivery Gaps	2	18	11%
Complaints	0	18	0%
CSP timelines	15	18	83%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	96%	0	3	1	88.6%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	6747	170	884	73	3.24	3.18	4.14

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kohala March 2003

### Internal Review Results

n=12

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>75% (n=9)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>25% (n=3)</b>	<b>100% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

75%  
(n=9)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	%
Mainland Placements	0	13	0%
Out of Home	3	13	15%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	13	0%
Complaints	0	13	0%
CSP timelines	8	13	62%

Staffing	Vacancies	%
.76	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	1	0	95.8%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education Over Regular Education Suspension Ratio		
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	02-03 SY Actual Enrollment	02-03 SY *State Average	01-02 SY *State Average
<b>Totals</b>	805	40	141	15	2.14	2.75	5.17

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education



## State-level Feedback on Internal Review Reports

Each Internal Review generates a report on the results of the Internal Review, reporting on core performance indicators, and an improvement plan on areas identified as needing strengthening based on review of findings and data. The overall goal is to imbed reflective practice at all levels that will facilitate adjustments improvements that is based on accurate, current data. To assure an accurate read and proactive improvement strategies, the reports are reviewed and feedback is provided. Each report is due thirty days following the conclusion of the Internal Review, and feedback due back to the complex within another thirty days. Although some complexes and the State offices of DOE and CAMHD had initial difficulty in meeting these timelines, currently 100% of reports have been submitted and responded to. Feedback is given in two main areas: the quality of the report and review process, and the quality of the improvement plan. The plan itself can be accepted, accepted with refinements recommended, or commented on with a request for a revised plan.

Half of the submittals did not include an improvement plan. Complexes seemed to struggle with meeting the requirement to develop an interagency plan within the time period, or seemed unaware of the requirement. Communication with complex area and FGC leadership regarding the Internal Review framework and its relationship to local-level quality assurance including peer review was found to be remiss, and needs further strengthening.

Of the plans that were submitted, 27% of plans were accepted, and 17% were accepted but recommended refinements. Nearly two-thirds of the complex submittals had evidence to show the complex has an established process to identify and address challenges. Many of these complexes identified measurable accountable improvement strategies. However, 57% of complexes were asked to submit a revised plan, indicating a need for clear expectations to be communicated on the attributes of an acceptable improvement plan. Half the plans submitted adequately addressed the challenges that had been identified by the complex, but the other half did not. While many of the plans submitted had measurable actions, they tended to lack accountable timelines by indicating that their activities are “ongoing.” Only 20% of plans included a monitoring component that indicates desired outcomes and measures for evaluation, although the ones that did imbedded this activity into their quality assurance meetings.

Because generating clear strategies that are implemented and evaluated for effectiveness are a cornerstone to program improvement, complex personnel across DOE and DOH will need clearer guidelines about what is required, and the importance of the process in maintaining a sustainable service system. The Internal Reviews tended to identify salient and compelling information that needs to be acted upon. However, without accountability for improvements, the evaluation conducted through Internal Reviews becomes a missed opportunity in some areas. State DOE and CAMHD leadership is committed to addressing these identified needs in the June review of the Internal Review process.

## Summary

The year to date implementation of Integrated Monitoring has provided multiple forums for discussions on the status of services and supports for youth across the State. As the impetus for making improvement shifts from external mandates to a continuous improvement framework, staff and communities are experiencing both validation of their progress and effective practices, and reminded of the continual work it takes to maintain a service system for youth and families. Maintaining the credibility and integrity of the review process and accountability for implementing improvements are core issue for State leadership.

While the majority of complexes demonstrated they are maintaining the gains made over past several years, the complexes that are not performing well will need focused attention at several levels. Starting with the implementation of internal improvement plans to infusing necessary technical assistance and external examination to barriers, performance issues need to be addressed immediately in order to assure sustainability of results.

Overall, the Internal Review Process is a viable method for assessment and determining the status of the service system on a statewide basis. Its sustainability will be strengthened through installing appropriate measures for maintaining its integrity and rigor. It is also essential to more closely integrate the reviews as a part of the function of local level quality assurance. Internal reviews are a part of quality assurance and should not be seen as discrete functions, but as a fully integrated system that is integral to the State's commitment for sustainable continuous improvements.